



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,602	08/31/2001	Kia Silverbrook	AP73US	7468
24011	7590	06/13/2006	EXAMINER	
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD 393 DARLING STREET BALMAIN, NSW 2041 AUSTRALIA			WU, XIAO MIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/942,602

Applicant(s)

SILVERBROOK, KIA

Examiner

XIAO M. WU

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,8 and 11-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,8 and 11-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 8, 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo US Patent No. (6,512,497) in view of Muller et al. (US Patent No. 6,182,899), Swartz et al. (US Patent No. 6,095,418) and Rentsch (US Patent No. 5,541,396).

As to claims 1, 8, Kondo discloses an electronic text and/or graphics presentation device including: receiving means such a window for receiving a storage means such as a CD, scanning means (e.g. optical scanner for reading or scanning a CD 5); a user input control means (13, 14, Fig. 1); processing means ((21, Fig. 2) coupled to the scanning means the programming means operatively programmed to generate a data signal corresponding to the text and/or graphics in response to control signal from the user input control means; and a display means (11, 12, Fig. 1) arranged to received the data signal from the processing means and display the text and/or graphics.

It is noted that Kondo does not specifically disclose a window for observing a card received in the receiving means and the card is the recording or storage medium having a printed pattern encoding text and/or graphics of a plurality of pages of a document printed thereon.

Muller is cited to teach a loading mechanism for receiving a memory card from a window by using a roller mechanism (see Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2629

art to have modified Kondo as modified with the features of the roller mechanism for a memory card as taught by Muller because Muller provides a easy way for loading and unloading the memory card.

Swartz is cited to teach a pattern encoding text and/or graphics can be printed in a card and the information stored in the card can be decoded and displayed on a screen (see Fig. 4). Rentsch is further cited to teach a pattern encoding text and/or graphics of a plurality of a documents printed thereon and the information stored in the card are readable by computer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have replaced the recording medium of Kondo with the features of encoding information stored in a card as taught by Swartz and the features of a plurality of pages printed thereon as taught by Rentsch because the stored information of both Swartz and Rentsch can be reproduced in a simple way and cost much less than a CD.

As to claim 2, Kondo discloses a foldable housing comprising first and second housing portions pivotal relative to each other (see Fig. 1).

As to claim 3, Kondo discloses a common spine (16, Fig. 1).

As to claims 14 and 15, it would have been obvious to have two print circuit boards because two displays can be driven by their own drivers.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo US Patent No. (6,512,497) in view of Muller et al. (US Patent No. 6,182,899), Swartz et al. (US Patent No. 6,095,418) and Rentsch (US Patent No. 5,541,396) as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Isao (JP 2001-100667).

Art Unit: 2629

As to claim 4, it is noted that Kondo, Swartz, Rentsch and Muller do not disclose the spine includes a battery compartment. Isao is cited to teach two foldable displays similar to Kondo. Isao further disclose that the spine includes a battery compartment (41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Kondo as modified with the features of the battery compartment in the spine as taught by Isao so that the display housing can be designed thinner.

4. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo US Patent No. (6,512,497) in view of Kondo US Patent No. (6,512,497) in view of Muller et al. (US Patent No. 6,182,899), Swartz et al. (US Patent No. 6,095,418) and Rentsch (US Patent No. 5,541,396) as applied to claims 1-3 and 10 above, and further in view of Phillipps (US Patent No. 6,107,988)

As to claim 11, it is noted that Kondo, Swartz, Rentsch and Muller do not disclose a flexible display. Phillipps is cited to teach a foldable display similar to Kondo. Phillipps further discloses that the display is a flexible display (see col. 4, lines 62-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Kondo as modified with the features of the flexible display as taught by Phillipps because the flexible display is not easy to break.

As to claim 12, it is well known in the art that the LCD can be a bi-stable (e.g. on or off states).

As to claim 13, Phillipps discloses a loop of a flexible display upon pivoting the first and second housing portions to a closed position in order that creasing of the display is avoided (see Fig. 11, and col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 3).

5. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo US Patent No. (6,512,497) in view of Muller et al. (US Patent No. 6,182,899), Swartz et al. (US Patent No. 6,095,418) and Rentsch (US Patent No. 5,541,396) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ohara et al. (US Patent No. 6,052,117).

As to claim 16, it is noted that Kondo, Swartz, Rentsch and Muller do not disclose the input control means including a joystick. Ohara is cited to teach notebook type display similar to Kondo. Ohara discloses a joystick in the device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Kondo as modified with the feature of the joystick as taught by Ohara so as to provide an input control for the display.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 4/2/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Kondo, nor any of the cited references, provides a presentation device with the advantage of the user being able to conveniently observe the card being read in use, since printed data cards remain stationary when scanned, a user can easily read information printed on a reverse side of the card through a window. This argument is not persuasive because they are not found in claims. The claimed only requires "a window for observing a card received in the receiving means. Both Kondo and Muller clearly disclose a window for receiving the storage means. The user can observe the storage means from the window while the storage means is loading into the window. Therefore, the broadly claimed structures are still met by the prior art references.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to XIAO M. WU whose telephone number is 571-272-7761. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RICHARD HJERPE, can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2629

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

x.w.

June 9, 20006



XIAO M. WU
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2629